

D. REMARKS

In the Final Office Action dated 06/17/2005, the examiner allowed claims 8-18 and objected to claims 2-6 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim.


However, in this rejection, the examiner also objected to claim 1 stating that "Claim 1 contains the phrase 'target directory with cache file...' when it should be 'target directory with a cache file.'" It became obvious to Applicants' attorney that the examiner had misinterpreted the claims since there is no mention of a cache in any of the claims. The examiner misread the word "each" for "cache". Since such a misinterpretation could also affect the interpretation of the other claims and application of the art thereto, Applicants' attorney called the examiner on 08/17/05 to point out the examiner's error and that a new Examiner's Action should be sent. Because, the examiner had based his final rejection on an erroneous reading of the claims, during that interview, it was agreed that the examiner would do an examiner's amendment incorporating claim 4 into claim 1. On 10/06/05 Applicants' attorney again talked with the Examiner about the conversation on 08/17/05. The examiner requested an email to that effect, so an email was sent on 10/10/2005, stating that the examiner's amendment should cancel claims 4, 7, 19-21 and amend claim 1 with claim 4 as shown. On 10/12/05, the examiner stated in an email that he had received the information and would act on it either that day or the next. Although that never happened, it was Applicants' belief that it would.

In view of the foregoing, withdrawal of the rejections and the allowance of the current pending claims is respectfully requested. If the Examiner feels that the pending

AUS920010030US1

claims could be allowed with minor changes, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned to discuss an Examiner's Amendment.

Respectfully submitted,



Marilyn Smith Dawkins
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 31,140
(512) 823-0094

AUS920010030US1

10